

**MINUTES**  
**MICHIGAN STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING**  
**April 27, 2006**  
**Lansing, Michigan**

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

Present:                Ted Wahby, Chairman  
                             Linda Miller Atkinson, Vice Chairwoman  
                             Vincent J. Brennan, Commissioner  
                             Maureen Miller Brosnan, Commissioner  
                             James R. Rosendall, Commissioner  
                             James S. Scalici, Commissioner

Also Present:        Kirk Steudle, Director  
                             Frank E. Kelley, Commission Advisor  
                             Marneta Griffin, Executive Assistant  
                             Jerry Jones, Commission Auditor  
                             Patrick Isom, Attorney General, Transportation Division  
                             John Friend, Bureau Director, Highway Delivery  
                             John Polasek, Bureau Director, Highway Development  
                             Larry Tibbits, Chief Operations Officer  
                             Myron Frierson, Bureau Director, Finance and Administration  
                             Susan Mortel, Bureau Director, Transportation Planning  
                             Rob Abent, Bureau Director, Multi-Modal Transportation  
                             Bill Shreck, Director, Office of Communications  
                             Tim Hoeffner, Administrator, Intermodal Policy  
                             Carmine Palombo, Asset Management Council

A list of those people who attended the meeting is attached to the official minutes.

Chairman Wahby called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the Bureau of Aeronautics Commission Conference Room in Lansing, Michigan.

**I.        COMMISSION BUSINESS**

Commission Minutes

Chairman entertained a motion for approval of the minutes of the joint meeting between the State Transportation Commission and the Michigan Aeronautics Commission of March 30, 2006.

Moved by Commissioner Brennan, with support from Commissioner Brosnan, to approve the minutes of the joint meeting between the State Transportation Commission and the Michigan Aeronautics Commission of March 30, 2006. MOTION CARRIED.

Chairman entertained a motion for approval of the minutes of the State Transportation Commission meeting of March 30, 2006.

Moved by Commissioner Brosnan, with support from Commissioner Scalici, to approve the minutes of the Commission meeting of March 30, 2006. MOTION CARRIED.

Chairman Wahby acknowledged those in attendance for *National Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day*. In attendance: Shianna Fuller, granddaughter of Larry Tibbits, and Mary Fredendall, daughter of Daniel Fredendall, President of ACEC.

## II. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT – DIRECTOR STEUDLE**

Director Steudle's presentation focused on:

### **Transportation Agreement**

The *Transportation Agreement* was announced on April 21, 2006 by Governor Granholm, Senate Majority Leader Sikkema and House Speaker DeRoche. Governor Granholm has a targeted road map and it's moving Michigan in the right direction. The Governor's plan drives job creation, paves the way for growth all across Michigan, and creates an unprecedented partnership with Michigan communities. Some of the components of this: earmarks money for specific projects across the state (includes approval of some projects that were previously vetoed that will be part of a supplemental budget but not included in the boilerplate), passage of Transit bill, passage of *Local Jobs Today*, passage of MDOT supplemental budget (restoring funding to AMTRAK, IT projects, Multi-Modal), and Travel Michigan Funding. Legislation is expected to clear the Legislature soon for the Governor's approval.

Some of the projects that were vetoed by the Governor as part of a previous budget proposal include: I-75 business spur intersection of M-139 (Sault Ste. Marie)\Teal Lake Project (Marquette County), MTU Skyway (Houghton), M-25 overlay from St. Clair County line to village of Lexington, Wixom Road interchange (Oakland County), US-131 Constantine bypass and ROW acquisition for four-lane in the future (St. Joseph County), Latson Road overpass and \$7.5 million ROW assistance for bridge construction (Livingston County), Milbocker Road overpass (Otsego County), Study of I-75 expansion (M-59 to 8 Mile Road, Oakland County), US-127 Ithaca to St. Johns, Ford/Beck Road interchange (Wayne County), M-59 from Crooks/Ryan (Oakland County), Woodward/Lincoln Safety Improvements (Oakland County), US-2/CR 521 Conrail bridge improvements (Mason), US-31/Stebbins Road interchange (Muskegon), M-150/Rochester Road (5 year program reinsertion) (Oakland County), M-37 improvements (Kent County), Boardman River Bridge (Traverse City), and traffic light on M-99 (Eaton County). Projects not included in the agreement will be decided by MDOT, CRAM and the Michigan Municipal League.

*Local Jobs Today* will grow Michigan's economy and maximizes available federal dollars to get shovels in the ground and dirt flying. It grants \$80 million in state funds to local communities for local match on federal projects, gets \$400 million in projects underway for the 2006-2007 construction seasons, and creates 7,100 jobs.

The provision to improve public transit allows local transit agencies to use millages to fund the required local match for federal transit funds. In 2005 the Kooiman bill (Rep. Jerry Kooiman, R-Grand Rapids) was vetoed by the Governor because it gave tax authority to only Grand Rapids. The new bill includes provision to assist Southeast

Michigan if that region comes up with its own mass transit effort. Governor will sign this bill now that Southeast Michigan has been included.

Within the high priority transit projects are a number of them across the state that are for expanding transportation facilities: Genesee County, Bay Region, Flint-Mass Transportation Authority Bus Maintenance Facility, \$2,000,000 earmark; Muskegon County, Grand Region, Muskegon Area Transit Terminal and related expenses, \$1,672,000 earmark; Wayne County, Metro Region, Detroit, an enclosed heavy-duty maintenance facility with full operational functions for up to 300 buses, \$3,762,000 earmark; Wayne County, Metro Region, Detroit Bus Maintenance Facility, \$7,524,000 earmark; St. Clair County, Metro Region, Port Huron-Blue Water Area Transportation Commission, bus maintenance facility, \$5,500,000 earmark; Oakland County, Metro Region, Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation (SMART) bus maintenance facility, \$5,500,000 earmark; Mackinac County, Superior Region, Eastern Upper Peninsula ferry dock and facility upgrades for Drummond Island Ferry Service, \$209,000 earmark; Marquette County, Superior Region, Michigan Transit Authority bus passenger facility, \$1,200,000 earmark.

No questions were forthcoming.

### **2006-2010 Economic Benefits Final Report**

Annually, MDOT commissions a study to assess the economic benefits of the Five-Year Road and Bridge Program. This involves the University of Michigan's Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, and the Economic Development Research Group. The study used an economic model called the Regional Economic Model or (REMI) to calculate benefits of the program. The study assessed the economic benefits resulting from the implementation of the road and bridge projects within the five-year program. Specifically the study assessed: type of work (i.e., preservation, IC/NR, maintenance, etc.), location of work (i.e., in-state vendors vs. out-state), and who is doing the work (i.e., private contractors vs. MDOT staff). The second key input used in the REMI model was identifying travel-time savings associated with projects in the Five-Year Program. These savings come from two sources: savings associated with new roads or projects which add capacity to our system (this added capacity assists in reducing congestion on our system), and savings associated with improved vehicle speeds as a result of improved pavement conditions.

All results were compared back to a base case where no investment is made by MDOT and the state's road and bridge infrastructure are allowed to deteriorate. This study captured both the Direct effects (i.e., construction jobs, MDOT jobs, etc.) and Spin-off effects (i.e., purchases from local suppliers, and spending by people who receive income attributable to activities related to transportation policy (i.e., a person working in a sign-manufacturing factory buying a new car). Direct effect plus Spin-off effects provides the total impact our highway program has on Michigan's economy.

Study findings show that implementing the 2006-2010 Road and Bridge Program creates: travel time savings for Michigan households (\$14.6 million in 2006 and accumulates to \$71.0 million by 2010), travel time savings for Michigan businesses (\$10.3 million in 2006 and accumulates to \$51.0 million by 2010), and generates \$6.8 billion in Gross

State Product. University of Michigan estimates MDOT's highway program will create 30,824 jobs in 2006. Of these jobs, approximately 60% are non-construction with a large portion consisting of technical jobs in the professional services and business sectors.

When you compare the results of this years' economic analysis to the 2005 report, it is estimated that with *Jobs Today* and the continuation of the *Preserve First Initiative* it will create approximately 4,725 more jobs in 2006, will add approximately \$300 million more of Gross State Product in 2006, and will add approximately \$200 million more real personal income over 2005 levels. Clearly MDOT's 2006-2010 highway program is having positive impacts on Michigan's economy.

Commissioner Brennan asked, if you combine *Jobs Today* and the *Transportation Agreement* with the current roads budget, where we are at in terms of volume.

Mr. Steudle answered that in the next two years the expenditure part of the investment in transportation (roads and bridges across the state on all levels of the system from the state to the county and city system on the federal aid part) is unprecedented at anytime in our history. It is a significant investment—potentially \$400 million for *Local Jobs Today* that advances into two years; the green light projects in *Jobs Today* which have been advanced into the construction program is much higher than any program that we have had in the past.

Commissioner Brennan stated that it is worth noting because everyone gets the feedback about the orange barrels. The point, however, is that when the barrels are gone the road is smoother, wider and safer. There are going to be complaints along the way but this is a necessary evil to get to those smoother, wider and safer roads.

Mr. Steudle agreed and gave as an example the volume of complaints received during the work on I-94 from the airport into downtown (Detroit). This was probably the worse road in the entire state two years ago; now they continue to get accolades from the public.

Commissioner Atkinson stated that it is easy to focus on the paving of roads in the *Preserve First Initiative*, but as she travels she sees it more in the passing lanes and bridges. People are unaware of how significant the repair to bridges is in the *Preserve First Initiative* and how important it has been in enhancing transportation. All the way across the Upper Peninsula traffic is now much more manageable because of those two parts of the program; especially the passing lanes. For a long time the main complaint was regarding US-2. Now, with the eleven new passing lanes between Rapid River and St. Ignace, the traffic flow is so much better.

Mr. Steudle responded that it is seen all across the state that the passing relief lanes have made a significant improvement.

No other questions were forthcoming.

### **Construction Quality Partnership Charter**

At the March Commission meeting, it was reported that the department planned to have a Charter for the Michigan Construction Quality Partnership (CQP) signed at the next

meeting. As reported then, starting in 2003 we worked with various industry groups to improve the quality of highway construction in Michigan. We moved from conversations about warranties, to actions about quality. These efforts have led us to where we are ready for the signing of the charter of the Michigan CQP.

Mr. Steudle introduced Larry Tibbits, MDOT Chief Operations Officer and Glenn Bukoski, MITA Vice President of Engineering Services.

Mr. Tibbits reported that the CQP is a comprehensive approach to continuous improvement of the State's transportation system. "Why initiate the CQP?" We know that the customers, the taxpayers who invest in transportation, are changing their expectations. For example, construction projects are completed faster than in the past, and the customers now want those projects to be completed even faster. AAA recently reported that 51% of their 44 million members are not satisfied with the transportation systems we have in the U.S. Michigan is not alone in that situation. Taxpayers want it better, faster, and cheaper, and so do we!! The "status quo" is not acceptable. MDOT is partnering with the industry to be "better, faster and less expensive."

CQP got its roots and grew out of the warranty discussions in 2003. The Strategic Forum on Quality and Warranties in June 2004 is where the CQP initiative "got its legs" as the 60 attendees who represented owners, contractors, and consultants all embraced the shift to continuous quality improvement, which includes process control at all stages. CQP is not a substitute for warranties.

The materials testing and supplier certification programs are general models that involve an independent third-party administration and monitoring to insure a certain level of competency and quality is maintained in personnel, operations, and products. The ideal model CQP can be built on the Bridge Painting Certification Program that will be implemented in October 2006. Under that program contractor's pre-qualified for bridge painting must have SSPC, QP1 and QP2 Certification in order to "bid" as a prime or subcontractor on MDOT work.

Mr. Bukoski reported that CQP is not just contractor quality. CQP is "construction" quality involving the owner agencies, the contractor community, and the consulting engineer community who perform in our industry as owner representatives. CQP is a comprehensive training and skill development initiative that will ultimately affect every aspect of our transportation industry.

Our CQP goal is total and continuous quality process improvement throughout all elements, within all disciplines, and at all corporate and agency levels within the transportation industry. This initiative goes a step beyond some of the more traditional quality efforts that tend to focus exclusively on materials. Our CQP effort will focus on skills development and the process strings from project scoping to post-construction feedback. To put our vision in a perspective that is easier to comprehend, think about back about 30 years ago and recall the then new concept "jobsite safety." Now look at today and recognize how safety has become an integral part of every corporate and agency philosophy, from the top of the organization to the bottom that we all now know can have a significant impact on the bottom line. We believe there is a direct analogy

between where we are today with quality and the way safety was viewed some 30 years ago. Our challenge on this CQP journey is to integrate quality into every corporate and agency philosophy just as safety is today.

Initially training people and developing a skilled workforce is our first objective; with personnel certification the goal of that objective. Personnel certifications will include contractor, MDOT, and consultant personnel alike. It is our vision that these personnel certifications will be voluntary initially but eventually will become mandatory—mandatory to ensure everyone in our industry, in all disciplines and at all levels, attains and maintains the knowledge and skill set needed to deliver the quality products our customers demand. Ultimately, out there at some point in time on this CQP journey, contractor and consultant corporate certification is a goal—a third-party certification that would assure that every corporate philosophy includes “quality” as one of its cornerstones just like they currently include “safety.” For the owners, beyond personnel certifications, our long-term goal is one of improved agency processes, focusing on the procedures and mechanics utilized in making agency decisions.

The benefits of this CQP initiative to our customers and our industry are: First, through the envisioned training and skill development effort we believe we can enhance and improve the quality and value of the transportation products we deliver to our customers (meeting their expectations for better, faster, cheaper)—higher quality, delivered faster, at a better value; second, it is not unrecognized that grade school age interest in the construction industry and technical careers is on a decline (when we were kids, we played in the sand box with our Tonka trucks, digging and moving sand, building roads, dreaming about becoming builders, engineers, or contractors). Kids today don’t do that; they sit at their computers surfing the web or IMing their friends, dreaming about being the next Bill Gates or Vince Young. We believe this CQP initiative can help address our current and future personnel needs by implementing a comprehensive training effort that will result in a highly skilled and trained industry workforce; third, we believe this CQP initiative provides our industry the opportunity to reduce risk—risk associated with project scoping, design, bidding, construction, and performance, for everyone (the owners, the contractors, and the consultants). We believe this initiative can help all of us in the industry manage and reduce more of these risks as it establishes a criteria for a skilled workforce that is focused on continuous quality process improvement; lastly, we believe this CQP initiative can pay huge dividends in terms of positive public relations as our industry demonstrates its commitment to a quality focus and continuous quality improvement. We can increase public trust in the transportation decisions we make and products we deliver.

Mr. Tibbits continued...

CQP is a significant paradigm shift. It’s a move in focus from “end-product” inspections where the contractor is saying “we believe we built it according to your plans and specifications” and the owner or owner representative is saying “we think you built it to our plans and specifications”. Post-construction warranties are an effort to assure some level of anticipated or perceived quality. CQP is a shift away from those lines of thinking to one of “continuous quality process control at all stages of the development and delivery processes”. Our goal in the development and promotion of this concept is to

have a quality focus that saturates the entire construction process—from project development through the completion of construction.

Ultimately, the goal of the CQP initiative is putting the “Right People”—well trained, highly skilled, quality focused personnel at all levels (scoping, design, construction, inspection, project management, contractors, MDOT, consultants)—building the “Right Fix”—the Fix selection based on quality agency processes that insure the fix is appropriate for the existing conditions and the anticipated performance.

Mr. Bukoski continued...

In closing, an Executive Steering Committee was formed in late 2004 and it continues to meet on a regular basis. The steering committee membership includes representatives from the eight partners that will be signing the charter. This steering committee is co-chaired by Larry Tibbits, MDOT’s Chief Operations Officer, John Friend, MDOT’s Bureau Director for the Bureau of Highway Delivery, Dan DeGraaf, Executive Director of the Michigan Concrete Paving Association, and Glenn Bukoski, all of which demonstrates a very high level of commitment by the industry partners to this initiative.

As it was not our intent to implement this comprehensive training and skill development initiative and require a bunch of new training courses and materials be developed, we rather wanted to take advantage of what has already been developed. It was with those thoughts of not reinventing the wheel in mind that we started this effort with the paving and capital preventive maintenance disciplines. The executive steering committee has established 3 training subcommittees—concrete paving, asphalt paving, and capital preventive maintenance—whose charges include collecting and compiling lists and information about existing training opportunities, and best practices within their distinct disciplines. As those subcommittees compile and formalize their lists, those lists will be reviewed and manipulated into a “training curriculum” for personnel certification within each discipline. As our CQP goal of “improved agency processes” mirrors the initiatives of the Design Task Force (another task force established as a result of the 2004 Strategic Forum on Quality and Warranties) specifically as it relates to improvements in the project development process, the steering committee has delegated our interest to that task force so that efforts are not duplicated. Specific to these efforts are the development of: “Fix Selection Guidelines” to insure a proper mix of fixes is maintained such that when a fix is selected it is appropriate for the existing conditions and the anticipated performance of the fix; scoping and constructability check lists that can be used to insure certain critical success and quality factors are considered in the project scoping and design phases; and a formalized Post Construction feedback loop (for a “lessons learned, what went right, what went wrong” feed back process that would add quality to the next generation of projects).

Signing are: Jim Steele, FHWA Division Administrator; Bruce Culver, CRAM President; Kirk Steudle, MDOT Director; Daniel Fredendall, ACEC President; Peter Scodeller, MRPA President; Jim Klett (for APAM President, Keith Rose); Michael Catenacci, MCPA President; and Steven Mancini, MITA President.

No other questions were forthcoming.

III. **OVERSIGHT**

Commission Agreements (Exhibit A) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson stated that information on 25 projects and agreements were given for review. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval of Exhibit A.

Commissioner Atkinson asked regarding Item #5 (2006-5124 between MDOT and the Mackinac County Road Commission), if it is possible for part of Marquette Township to be in Mackinac County.

Mr. Frierson answered that he would check it out and get an answer back to her.

No other questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Atkinson and supported by Commissioner Rosendall to approve Exhibit A. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Bid Letting Pre-Approvals (Exhibit A-1) – Myron Frierson

Mr. Frierson first gave a brief re-cap of the April letting. There were 20 state projects with an engineers' estimate of \$48.3 million; low bids were \$49.8 million; average low bid was \$2.5 million. The write-up indicates 3 items with low bids yet to be announced, but there are actually 2—the department exercised the option to request the Commission Chairman to approve a waiver for the 1. This was due to the expedited nature of the project which needs to be completed before the summer travel season.

In terms of overall statistics for the year, we have let 324 state projects with an engineers' estimate of \$613.8 million, representing 76.1% of the number of projects and 55.5% of the total dollar amounts projected to be let. Based on our planned delivery of projects we are on schedule and anticipate a fairly large letting of state projects in September. In terms of overall participation, average bids were about 5 per item. In terms of the number of contractors who actually bid with us, almost half participated in the last letting.

Before the Commission for approval are bid items for the May letting—95 total projects with engineers' estimates totaling \$106 million. Pending any questions, Mr. Frierson asked for approval of the bid items for the May letting in Exhibit A-1.

No questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Brennan to approve the May bid letting. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Letting Exceptions Agenda (Exhibit A-2) – John Polasek

Mr. Polasek reported on seven items (2 state and 5 local) that were 10% over the estimates which are accompanied by justification memos. Pending any questions, Mr. Polasek asked for approval of Exhibit A-2.



Commissioner Brosnan asked for clarification on item #7 (Proposal 0604037—9.92 miles of hot mix asphalt...on Ruth Road and Atwater Road in Huron County).

Mr. Polasek answered that he was not sure but it might be a local mix that they would rather use, that our contractors are not familiar with.

Commissioner Brosnan further asked whether the asphalt mix meets a standard that we have within MDOT, wanting to clarify that the asphalt used was not below standard.

Mr. Polasek answered that it wouldn't be below standard; it would have to meet a certain type of performance criteria in order to be eligible for federal aid.

No other questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brosnan and supported by Commissioner Atkinson to approve Exhibit A-2. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

Contract Adjustments (Exhibit B) – John Friend

Mr. Friend reported that for the month of March we finaled out at \$79 million worth of work within less than 1% over budget. For the fiscal year-to-date we continue to remain under budget for the total program. Pending any questions, Mr. Friend asked for approval of Exhibit B which includes 3 MDOT projects and 0 local agency projects.

No questions were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby entertained a motion. Motion was made by Commissioner Brennan and supported by Commissioner Brosnan to approve Exhibit B. Motion carried on a unanimous voice vote.

IV. **PRESENTATIONS**

Asset Management Council 2005 Annual Report – Carmine Palombo

Mr. Palombo acknowledged Kirk Steudle, Susan Mortel, Rick Lilly and Stacey Schafer (Student Intern) as members of the Council.

This Annual Report highlights the activities performed in 2005 that continue previous efforts aimed at the Council fulfilling its stated mission. It is just as important to recognize that while the Council makes progress in achieving our goals, we do so in a cooperative and coordinated effort. The progress that is reported comes only through the cooperation of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), the county road commissions and the cities and villages, assisted by the townships, counties, metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) and regional planning agencies.

**Background**

The Asset Management Council (AMC) was created by the Legislature in 2002. The legislation requires that we develop an asset management approach for all public roads and bridges in the state. It also establishes common definitions, requires the Council to

recommend an asset management strategy to the State Transportation Commission (STC). In order to do this efficiently and effectively we have to have a common condition assessment measure and regularly collect data from local agencies.

MDOT is required to provide all administrative activities of the Council and the MPOs and regional planning agencies provide technical support. They do this by coordinating our data collection efforts and setting up training for local road agencies in their areas. There is a “central data agency”, which is responsible for storing and managing the data collected by the Council. This agency is the Center for Geographic Information (CGI). There are 11 members on the Council representing county road commissions, cities/villages, MDOT, townships, county boards of commissioners and planning agencies. The Council is required to report each year to the STC and Legislature on: condition of the roads and bridges, how much money is being spent on the system, and what work is planned for the next three years.

### **Goals/Objectives**

The Council has adopted a goal statement and several objectives: Expand the practice of asset management statewide to enhance the productivity of investing in Michigan’s roads and bridges through coordination and collaboration among state and local transportation agencies by: surveying/reporting conditions by functional class, assessing investments, developing tools and procedures, education and training on the benefits of the asset management approach.

### **2005 Highlights**

We had a very productive year in 2005. We conducted our third year of PASER ratings on Michigan’s federal-aid eligible roads, developed a Michigan-based asset management training guide, selected RoadSoft for use in developing a statewide asset management strategy, and developed an Internet-reporting tool.

### **Reporting Categories**

We use the PASER rating system which is a 1-10 visual survey that rates the condition of the surface. We then roll the ratings up into 3 categories of: routine maintenance (8, 9, or 10), capital preventive maintenance (CPM) (5, 6 or 7), and structural improvement (1, 2, 3, or 4). These are the numbers we then report to the (STC) and the Legislature.

Routine maintenance is the day-to-day scheduled activities. Examples of routine maintenance include street sweeping, drainage clearing, gravel shoulder grading and sealing cracks.

CPM is a planned set of cost effective treatments to an existing roadway that retards further deterioration and maintains or improves the functional condition of the system without significantly increasing the structural capacity. The purpose of CPM is to protect the pavement structure, slow the rate of deterioration and correct pavement surface defects.

Roads in this category still show good structural support but the surface is starting to deteriorate requiring more extensive crack filling or seal coating. CPM can be viewed as

the heart and soul of asset management. It is intended to address pavement problems before the structural integrity of the pavement has been severely impacted.

Structural improvement involves roads where the structure is beginning to fail—rutting is beginning to take place, large patches are required, alligator cracking is evident, joints and cracks are badly spalled, and there are broken slabs requiring complete rebuilding. Roads in this condition require major reconstruction or resurfacing.

The results of the ratings for 2005 show that about 24% of our lane miles need routine maintenance, 62% need CPM, and about 15% need some type of structural improvement such as a reconstruction or major rehabilitation. The changes between 2004 and 2005 do not show a very encouraging picture. While we did improve over 17,000 lane miles, over 32,000 lane miles declined in condition. In other words nearly twice as many miles declined in condition from 2004 to 2005 than were improved.

### **Asset Management Guide**

Agencies around the world that have been involved in asset management for many years all point to education as being a critical component in the success of their processes. We have just finished the latest element of our education program with the publishing of an Asset Management Guide for Local Agencies. This, combined with courses from the Local Technical Assistance Program at Michigan Technological University (MTU) and the National Center for Pavement Preservation at MSU, gives us a strong group of resources to use statewide.

### **RoadSoft**

The Council decided in November to enter into a contract with Michigan Tech to develop a strategic analysis model as part of the RoadSoft program. RoadSoft is a pavement management tool that is available to all local agencies in Michigan at no cost to the agency. It is used by most of the agencies in Michigan. We have established a Model Analysis Team made up of experts from MTU, MDOT and the CGI to work with the Council on the development of the model. Once the model has been completed and tested we will be able to analyze current conditions and predict future conditions based on given levels of funding.

### **Internet-Reporting Tool**

One of the more exciting things that happened this last year was the development of the Asset Investment Reporting tool. This is a web-based tool that allows local agencies to submit information on how they are spending their money on roads and how they intend to spend it in the future. These are both aspects of the law that all agencies are required to comply with. This tool, combined with the strategic model in RoadSoft, will give the Council a very powerful analytical capability in the very near future.

### **2006 Activities**

The key activities we have planned for 2006 are generally a continuation of the 2005 activities.

On May 10<sup>th</sup> we are hosting the first annual Michigan Transportation Asset Management Conference. It will be a one day event at the Kellogg Center on the campus of Michigan

State University. Registration is \$30 for an individual from a local agency. Each additional person from that agency pays only \$20. For consultants or private companies the registration fee is \$100. You can register for the conference at the Michigan LTAP web site.

### **Major Benefits**

Working together in a cooperative fashion, we have begun the process of developing one methodology of collecting pavement condition data, have collected three years of data and have begun the analysis of the data. The analysis to date is a statement of the current conditions of the federal aid eligible roads in Michigan. As we continue with data collection, the analysis will mature to not only provide the existing condition of these pavements, but also project the current condition into the future and be able to assess various policy decisions on the future conditions of Michigan's public roads.

No questions were forthcoming.

## **V. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chairman Wahby asked if any Commissioner wanted to address the Commission.

Commissioner Brennan congratulated the CQP on creating this unprecedented statewide Charter, and requested that they be quick on their feet in light of the fact that we are spending more money than we ever have; which means we have more work and quality needs to be paid attention to more than ever.

No other comments were forthcoming.

Chairman Wahby asked if any member of the audience wanted to address the Commission.

No public comments were forthcoming.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.

The next full meeting of the Michigan State Transportation Commission will be held May 25, 2006 at the Macomb County Administration Building, Board of Commissioners Board Room, 1 South Main Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor, in Mt. Clemens, Michigan, commencing at the hour of 9:00 a.m.

---

Frank E. Kelley  
Commission Advisor